

~~CONFIDENTIAL~~

5 August 1974

MEMO FOR THE RECORD

SUBJECT

Discussions About SRI Performance

1. At 1030 hrs on 2 August 74 [REDACTED] visited the undersigned and three broad topics were discussed:

SG11

a. Results of the OOB Experiment: NPIC photos apparently do not support Price's remarks about the derricks, water tower, etc, although preliminary NPIC examination of the data seems to indicate the possibility of other, nearby ambiguous hits; in any case, [REDACTED] was to send NPIC all the transcribed data and his memo specifying what he'd like to have NPIC do in the way of analysis and commentary on 2 Aug; he offered to send us a copy and, if appropriate, to forward on to NPIC any new or significant suggestions we might make; he also offered to have us accompany him when (possibly late in the week of 5 Aug) he goes to NPIC for their first read-out; we reaffirmed the need to ensure that any similar OOB experiments in the future focused on highly unique, simple and uncluttered stimulus fields. SG11

b. Other Possible Use of NPIC: I mentioned the possibility of pursuing a related course with NPIC--that is, testing a number of our self-professed staff psychics (and an equal number of staff controls) against NPIC's thorniest interpretation problems (i.e., sequential photos in which only the very last clearly permits objective judgements about the nature/function of the site)--and then compare their 'readings' with those of the best NPIC analysts who worked on the original case.

c. SRI's Performance and Reporting: See para 2, below.

SG11

2. [REDACTED] asked if Hal or Russ had called and was puzzled when I said they hadn't since he'd spoken to them about a week earlier and had urged them to call me about some of their data. [REDACTED] said that he was under the impression, from them, that they had considerable data collected with respect to our task--e.g.: analysis of strobe-light/EEG data (note: possibly of interest but hardly responsive if this is the material from last year); some of the physical exam results on Price (note: really of consequence only when complete and when evaluated against other subjects); some mid-experiment instrumentation data on Price (this would be new, unless its the gradiometer data).

SG11

SG11

I told [REDACTED] that, obviously, we can judge the significance and adequacy of the data only when we've seen it and that I hoped they would send it along with their next (1 Aug?) report. He urged me to call them to stress that we wanted to see that data and I told him that: there can't possibly be any doubt in their minds that we do want to see it; and I'd been studiously avoiding calling them because I didn't want to confuse or harass them. Discussed this later with [REDACTED]

SG11

SG11
SG11

[REDACTED] and they confirmed my view; it was, evidently, again communicated to [REDACTED] by [REDACTED] when the former called at 1700 hrs on 2 Aug to see whether I'd made the call. At that time [REDACTED] said he thought he'd call SRI just to make sure that they realize we want to see the data in the next report--despite [REDACTED] position to the effect that it would be unfair and unrealistic for us to impose special reporting requirements on SRI each time they came up with a specific piece of data; we'd be quite satisfied if they would merely conform to the originally agreed-upon reporting scheme.

SG11

SG11

SG11

SG11